

Minutes

Environmental Cooperation Pilot Program - Advisory Group

February 16, 2000

Present: Caryl Terrell (Sierra Club); Randy Nedrelo (Northern Engraving); Michael Ricciardi (MGE); Michael Gromacki (Cook Composites and Polymers); Brian Borofka (Wisconsin Electric/ WI Environmental Working Group); John Piotrowski (Packaging Corp. of America); Karen Bender (Nestle Food); Lynda Wiese (WDNR).

Absent: Marilou Martin (EPA); Matt Redmann (Navistar); (Commerce).

Also Present: Jon Heinrich, facilitator (WDNR); Kim McCutcheon, note-taker (WDNR); Laurel Sukup (WDNR); Lynn Persson (WDNR); Ed Wilusz (WPC); John Shenot (WDNR); Annette Weissbach (WDNR); Mark Harings (WDNR); Kevin Lehner (ECSI); Pat Stevens (WMC); Joan Girard (Electrotek Corp.); Jeff Smoller (WDNR); Jerry Rodenberg (WDNR); Susan Lindem (WDNR)

ACTION ITEMS

By March 1, 2000

- ☉ Lynda Wiese will provide group members and interested parties a copy of a revised Performance Factors table that includes the changes and recommendations received at the February 16th meeting.
- ☉ Brian Borofka will elaborate upon the Program Performance and Evaluation Report the Advisory Group developed at the February 16th meeting and provide a copy for review and comment to group members and interested parties. Conceptually this report, prepared by the department, would supplement the performance factors established in individual pilot agreements, and would focus on overall program performance including the following:
 - 1) Number of program participants.
 - 2) A summary of benefits e.g. economic, environmental, social and administrative.
 - 3) A summary of lessons learned.
 - 4) Recommendations for program improvement.
 - 5) Observations from affected stakeholders e.g. environmental groups, citizens, business associations.

By March 17, 2000

- ☉ Comments due to Lynda Wiese on the revised Performance Factors table. As part of your review, please indicate who you believe should be responsible for data collection for each performance factor (DNR or program participant).
- ☉ Comments on the Program Performance and Evaluation Report concept due to Brian Borofka.

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, April 12, 2000

12:00 to 4:00 pm

Milwaukee – Brian Borofka will confirm WEPCO facility for site meeting.

I. Special Guest – Secretary George Meyer

Secretary Meyer provided his views on the Green Tier, WDNR's current pilot program, federal reinvention initiatives and ISO 14000. Secretary Meyer fielded the following questions from the audience:

Brian Borofka: What is the schedule to forward Green Tier? Secretary Meyer responded that no Green Tier will be proposed in this session, but hopefully by next session. DNR is also watching the development of Federal 2nd generation legislation.

Joan Girard: Florida –EPA Region 8 has metal finisher workshops on design of EMS – Does Wisconsin or Region V have a desire to put similar program in place. Jeff Smoller indicated that some states are out ahead on tool development. There is not a similar initiative here.

George discussed briefly the WDNR's proposed adoption of an environmental management system. The department is piloting 3 EMS design projects: Spooner Campus which includes a state of the art fish hatchery, Governor Nelson State Park with the possibility of including other recreational properties in the Basin, and the Waste Bureau with the Air Bureau shadowing the progress made by Waste.

Susan Lindem on behalf of Navistar: Please describe the relationship between Green Tier and current participants under a Cooperative Agreement. Secretary Meyer responded that both programs would likely share concepts with the addition of financial incentives into the Green Tier Legislation. The department is committed to carry on the successes of the Cooperative Agreements and would hope that pilot projects would participate in future Green Tier programs.

Brian Borofka: Green Tier policy should focus less on compliance and more on performance. George responded that he sincerely believes in voluntary tools versus mandatory tools.

II. Review of Minutes from 12/3/99 Meeting and Review and Amend Today's Agenda: Minutes were distributed and the advisory group was given time to review. Caryl suggests that this part of the agenda should be "received and reviewed minutes" and not "approve minutes". No amendments to today's agenda were needed.

III. Overview of Agenda and Today's Goals:

Lynda discussed that today will focus on final performance measures and if not final at least a strategy for completing this task. Lynda stressed that completion of this task is crucial so that WDNR can begin compiling data.

Caryl asked what the status of the EPA member was. Lynda responded that there was an unexpected conflict with today's meeting. Lynda also noted that the Department of Commerce member has accepted a new job and will no longer be representing the agency on this advisory

group. Lynda will seek a new member from Commerce. Jon Heinrich reminded the group that a Wrap-up session at the end of the agenda will provide the members an opportunity to discuss individual concerns.

IV. Presentation of Proposed Performance Measures Think-piece

Caryl complimented Brian on work well done and asked what the definition of emission was. Brian responded that emission should be considered all discharges to the environment.

Brian further explained how he processed the proposed matrix. Brian noted that there were no initial comments from the advisory group. He grouped the 14 statutory goals into categories and then populated the matrix with performance measures. Comments from the advisory group were incorporated into the present draft of the matrix.

Karen wanted to know what the numbers in parenthesis meant under Goals. Brian responded that the numbers were meant to keep track of the relative order the Goals according to the statute. John Shenot reiterated that we must keep in mind that the 14 Goals are WDNR obligations.

Jon went over a proposed process for reviewing the performance measures.

1. Additional Goals
2. Logical Combinations
3. Distinguish between program performance measures and individual agreement measures
4. Critical Success Factors
5. Data Collection

Caryl asked how the cross media issue was dealt with.

John P. wanted a definition of pollutant added. He was also concerned that the criteria used to measure success be carefully chosen.

Caryl stated that TRI is not a good targeting tool.

Kevin suggested that an approach to review environmental performance may be found in ISO 14031.

Lynda reinforced that participants are responsible for negotiating their project-specific performance measures.

Brian offered that this spreadsheet is a range of potential performance measures.

Lynn referred to the Category of Cost Savings and was wondering if this is what business really wanted.

Joan suggested that there are a number of crossover issues between categories that may capture this data.

Mark offered that UNC protocols already collect this data.

John S. was concerned that we may not be capturing essence of statutory obligations. Our objective is to compare command and control with cooperative agreement process.

Lynda asked what does the individual performance measures mean if they are “bubbled up” as a program evaluator?

Caryl suggested that all facilities might not be providing data to aggregate for critical success factors.

Comments on Chart - (time allowed for only three goals to be discussed.)

Provide Same Level of Protection

John S. suggested that tracking number of variances issued should be a performance measure.

Lynda suggested that a baseline needs to be established. Performance measures for the program may be emissions evaluated on three levels 1. Regulatory requirements 2. Base level Individual Facility outcomes 3. Performance levels under the Cooperative Agreement. Karen was concerned that goals from individual facilities might not look impressive enough. Caryl asked if presence of an EMS was superior environmental performance.

Achieve Superior Environmental Performance

Mike G. suggested that a maybe a profile of an ideal environmental company could be provided. Set-up broad categories of superior environmental performance and let the pilots assign themselves to these groups.

Joan didn't think this was quantifiable.

Brian didn't think we would find enough common denominators.

Caryl would like to add rate of enacting an EMS to achieve superior performance.

Lynda would like to add number of unregulated activities being addressed and where redirected resources are be funneled.

Mark would like to add that DNR needs to report on compliance with the Cooperative Agreement as a performance measure. Mike G. agreed.

Laurel asked if we have captured that a Cooperative Agreement is a catalyst to superior environmental performance.

Reduce Pollution Below Statutory Levels

John S. clarified that this goal is really directed toward working together to reduce pollution. He suggested that the Goal should be under Public Participation and Trust.

Brian disagreed and felt the focus was reducing pollution.

Mike G. felt that the goal should stay where it is.

Jon reminded the group that the matrix is a menu of options, the sum and total needs to be used for measuring performance of the program.

John P. suggested that the "tool" is modified and each participant report out on each line item and DNR could then summarize.

Brian suggested that the #1 performance measure was how many cooperative agreements are consummated. Don't get hung up on the details.

Joan doesn't believe the matrix gets to the program evaluation.

Caryl was concerned that aggregate data on each of the 14 Goals may not capture "learning" to evaluate the program and develop conclusions.

Brian suggested that there are 4 success factors 1. Number of parties in the program. 2. Benefits to a) natural environment b) economy c) social environment d) government agencies 3. Lessons learned both by companies and government 4) Administrative changes.

Caryl likes the proposal.

Annette suggested that the Benefits heading is actually "Sustainable Development"

Brian agreed but doesn't want to use the "s" word.

Joan feels two products are needed.

Jon suggested that we check in on progress for this agenda item. Based on discussion do we spend time identifying more performance measures for the spreadsheet?

Caryl would like to add under Goal (14) a qualitative statement when measuring any of these items.

Karen would like to add number of variances and trade-offs to Flexibility and Cost Savings (#8?)

John S. would like to add number of citizen complaints/ public inquiry under Increase Trust.

Lynda volunteered to work-up revised table based on today's discussion

Brian agreed to draft outline of report based on his description of success factors.
Jon stepped out of his facilitator role and stressed to the group that the membership needs to provide advice on how this outline is carried out
Pat Stevens made that proposal to the group to add 5. Observations of Others, which was accepted.

John Shenot stressed that the advisory group must tell WDNR what it expects us to be collecting as data elements.

Lynda followed up with we do not want the advisory group identifying individual successes for each of the performances measures.

Lynda further stressed that at year 4, WDNR would like the input of the Advisory group on the data gathered via the outline as discussed above.

Pat Stevens volunteered to comment on the outline

Joan stated that annual report also gauged progression.

Brian noted that lack of progress shows wariness of businesses to participate.

V. Wrap-up and Planning for Next Meeting

Lynda provided updated list of pilot projects.

Jon asked members if they had other issues.

John P. stated he is encouraged by help from the state. However he needs an EPA decision by March 1 or they will not pursue a cooperative agreement. He is still concerned about barriers imposed by EPA.

Brian stated we shouldn't rely on one person from EPA – an alternate should be expected at the Advisory Group meetings. Lynda will follow-up.

Group member proposed the following topics for discussion at the April meeting:

- Check in on Table development progress (members will be working off-line in between)
- Stakeholder involvement
- Progress report on cooperative agreement discussions/decisions by EPA.

The meeting was adjourned @ 4:10 p.m.